

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

THOMAS A. WEBER,

Plaintiff,

v.

TIME WARNER, INC., *et al.*,

Defendants.

Case No. C05-1706L

ORDER GRANTING MOTION
TO EXTEND TIME TO FILE
JOINT STATUS REPORT

On January 11, 2006, plaintiff filed a motion to extend time to file the joint status report. (Dkt. #57). Plaintiff argues that he has not received defendants' initial disclosures, so he cannot "finalize his sections to the Joint Report related to discovery."¹ Plaintiff's Motion at p. 2.

Defendants did not file a response to the motion to extend time. Instead, they inexplicably included their arguments in opposition to this motion in their unrelated, and improperly filed, motion to strike. The Court will not comb through the increasingly voluminous filings in this case to find a party's position on a pending motion. Instead, the Local Rules dictate that a party opposing a motion should file a response to that motion and title it

¹ Plaintiff has filed a separate motion to compel defendants to provide initial disclosures; that motion is noted for January 27, 2006.

1 “indicating the purpose of the paper.” Local Rule 10(e).²

2 Accordingly, the Court finds that plaintiff has shown good cause for an extension to file
3 the Joint Status Report, which must be filed no later than January 27, 2006.
4

5
6 DATED this 20th day of January, 2006.
7

8 

9 Robert S. Lasnik
10 United States District Judge
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

25
26 ² Even if the Court were to consider defendants’ arguments in their motion to strike as a
27 response, it would be untimely.